The Second Draft, and Universal Training

THE great task of classifying for military service under the draft law nearly 9,000,000 young men between the ages of twenty-one and thirty-one, by means of the questionnaire system, recently put into force by the War Department as a more definite means of procedure than that undergone in the first draft call, is now in full swing.

As applied to the City of New York this system involves the mailing of approximately 540,000 questionnaires to men available for army service, but who were not called out in the first draft. So staggering is the extensiveness and intricacy of the questionnaire system that it is well to clear up a few of the more involved points by a compact summary of just exactly what this new plan is. The following is a clear and concise statement of the draft requirements as now in force:

1. THE QUESTIONNAIRE.—Commencing at noon last Saturday week each of the local boards in every city, town and village of the United States began to mail daily to 5 per cent of the registered men the questionnaire, and posted the names of the men to whom it had been sent in its offices. This questionnaire must be answered and sworn to, with all supporting affidavits, and must be returned to the local board on or before the seventh day after the mailing of the questionnaire or the posting of the notice.

2. PENALTIES.—Failure to so return the questionnaire within the time limit may result in imprisonment for not more than one year, loss of right for exemption, or deferred classification and immediate induction into the military service.

3. PERSONS CONCERNED.—All persons who were over twenty-one years of age and under thirty-one years of age on June 5, 1917, must answer. This includes persons who have heretofore been exempted by either board, volunteers now in the military service, men who have no claims for exemption or deferred classification, men who have already been sent to the mobilization camps and returned because of physical unfitness, and every other person within the draft age, except men inducted into the military service under the draft and who have been accepted at the camp.

4. NOTICE AND TIME LIMIT.—The questionnaire, with the notice, will be mailed. Failure to receive it on account of change in address, a mistake of the postoffice or other causes does not excuse returning or extend the time. Registrants who fail to receive the questionnaire should inquire at the local board and examine the posted list.

5. DECISION ON CLASSIFICATION.—The local board will decide upon the classification and mail a notice of its finding.

6. APPEALS.—Registrants have the right, within five days after the decision of the local board, to appeal to the decision of the district board, the five days running from the date of the decision, even though the mailed notice for some reason is not received. The date of the decision can be ascertained from the local board's classification sheet.

7. MEDICAL EXAMINATION.—Physical or medical examinations will be made in all cases, including those heretofore exempted or rejected, but will be made after the return of the questionnaire and the decision of the local or district boards, or both, on a new five-day notice sent or posted by the local board. If a registrant who has been held as physically qualified for service is dissatisfied with the examination he may request a reëxamination by the medical advisory board. Every person held to be physically disqualified, "unless the disability is obvious without medical examination," must be reexamined by the medical advisory board. An appeal from the decision of the medical advisory board to the district board is also provided.

The declaration of Senator Reed the other day that young men should begin compulsory military training in the United States at the age of eighteen years finds support in "The St. Louis Post-Dispatch," which asserts:

"How soon we could begin this universal training system in view of the necessity of rushing the training of drafted men for active service in the field is a question of expediency. We have about 5,000,000 men available for this purpose under the draft, and every year about 600,000 men are added to those of the present draft age for whose registration legal provision should be made.

"We do not agree that young men under twenty-one should be called to the colors for active service. If we utilize all the men of draft age we will not need to call the boys into service. They should be permitted to complete their education and training for life work in conjunction with training for military service. It will be time to talk of calling immature youths to the colors when the supply of men is exhausted. Our first task is to get registered men ready for active service at the earliest possible moment."

"The Spokane Spokesman-Review," in urging the compulsory military training of young men below the present draft age, declares that the trouble is that the draft now calls young men of skill and experience from work to which they have become thoroughly accustomed, while the younger class, men who are just beginning to enter professions, and who have no particular fitness for their jobs because of their age and lack of experience, are absolutely exempt from any service.

Arising from the present draft system is, indeed, a fast-growing demand for universal military training on the part of a great many army officers of high rank and civilian leaders who recognize the necessity of such training. Secretary Baker, on the other hand, is opposed to any such legislation, arguing the hope that America will be able to keep out of any future wars. The question or theory of world disarmament after the present struggle is ended is one of the points in the Secretary's views. President Wilson is also said to be opposed to any legislation which would make military training either compulsory or permanent. It is generally accepted that the President would be one of the warmest advocates of a policy of general disarmament after the war.

Major General Hugh L. Scott, in his annual report as Chief of Staff, differs directly from Secretary Baker in his opinion on the matter of universal service. He recommends the adoption of universal military service as a national policy. Theodore Roosevelt, also, in his characteristic manner, is one of the most ardent advocates of the permanent system of training.

In a recent editorial, written by the Colonel in "The Kansas City Star," he not only attacked Secretary Baker, but also had his fling at the President. Thus:

"President Wilson speaks in military matters through his Secretary of War. The sole importance of the Secretary of War's report comes from its being the official declaration of the President. I discuss it as such. According to the reports in 'The New York World,' the Secretary of War states 'that he does not favor universal military training as a permanent policy.'

"Mr. Wilson's Secretary, therefore, takes what is in effect the position of Mr. Bryan, which was picturesquely phrased as being that a million men can at need spring to arms overnight. The Administration's attitude is less picturesquely expressed. But it is precisely as futile and as unspeakably mischievous from a standpoint of permanent national interest.

"Moreover, it is taken at the very time when the disastrous effect of the Administration's policy of complete unpreparedness is being shown by the admissions of General Crozier on the first day of the Congressional investigation.

"Mr Baker's report, Mr. Bryan's theory, and the things already shown by the Congressional investigation dovetail into one another. They stand in the relation of cause and effect. The Administration now officially and complacently announces that the policy which at this very moment has proved disastrous is to be persevered in for the future, and therefore assumes complete responsibility for every blunder and delay, and for all the misconduct, and announces that these blunders and delays and all this misconduct have taught us nothing, and that we are to amble onward in the same futile path until disaster overtakes us.

"Mr. Wilson's Administration officially declares that we shall persist in our own folly until we are betrayed in the mortar of dreadful calamity.

"The Administration now announces that we are not to alter this policy, and that we are to continue the do-nothing policy of refusal to prepare. If the American people follow the lead thus given them, they will be guilty of criminal folly."

The principal idea in the minds of men who think as Secretary Baker does is that there will be no war hereafter, according to "The Chicago Tribune," which declares:

"Our government policy is to hope for the best, and not be prepared for anything except a realization of ideal conditions. If the altruistic plans fail, we fail. To hope for the best and be ready for the worst is a rational scheme which seems to be out of consideration.

"Argument with Mr. Baker would be in vain. When men will not be changed in their opinions by so great a blow to their hopes as this war, and when they will not learn from the terrible struggles the United States is making to fight for its own safety, they will learn nothing from argument.

"We must hope, and do hope, that Congress is not so imperviously set in opinion. If a world court should be established as the result of a victory against Germany the United States will not be a less responsible party to the agreement if it is a strong party. If no agreement changing the forms of international dealings is reached, the United States will be safe by its own efforts. Universal service will not make the United States opposed to peace. It will make it safe against efforts to break the peace. . . .

"Universal military service, for which the Administration will not ask legislation, is a peace measure, not a war measure. It not only would insure the United States, but it would promote civil and social qualities which the nation needs. It would prevent waste, not make it."

Hearst's "New York American" observes:

"If our country had enjoyed universal military service ten years ago, it might beyond all doubt or question have sent one million soldiers to the battlefields of France in June and July, whose tremendous additional man power might have swept the German trenches backward to the Rhine and ended the war. This country wishes no such 'IFS' in another great emergency that may come to her with the rapidly advancing years. People of the United States will not forgive any laggard statesmanship that fails to prepare our motherland for this possible emergency."

A Pershing-to-Wilson Air Service

THE latest scheme for transatlantic flight is to deliver General Pershing's reports to President Wilson by air in forty-eight hours. Giovanni Caproni, the Italian creator of the Caproni air cruisers and battleplanes, is sponsor for the plan. He maintains that not only can the passage be made in two days, but that so doing will solve many problems created by the U-boat and cut down the time required to transmit communications from Washington to the seat of war to a fraction of the time required at present. Other suggestions in his article in "Flying" follow:

"The Washington-Paris air line can be operated in a few months—surely by next summer.

"It can be done by employing six of the largest Caproni machines, carrying the mail in relays.

"The route will have five legs, as follows:
"1. From Paris to Portugal.
"2. Portugal to the Azores.
"3. Azores to Newfoundland.
"4. Newfoundland to New York.
"5. New York to Washington.

"A separate machine and crew will be used for each leg and there will be one machine and crew in reserve.

"The longest distance over water in this route is the leg from the Azores to St. John's, Newfoundland, which is about 1,195 miles, therefore well within the flying range of our largest Caproni.

"The time of the trip may be cut down further by flying straight from the Azores to Paris, which is a distance of about 1,150 miles, without stopping in Portugal.

"It is hardly necessary to point out that the mail will be much safer carried by aeroplanes than carried by ships.

"The same U-boats that terrorize ships will be afraid of the mail-carrying aeroplanes, therefore the mail line will at the same time be an aerial U-boat patrol. The aeroplanes can be summoned by the ships' wireless to protect ships in distress. Carrying a few fifty-pound depth bombs will not add appreciably to the cargo of the mail-carrying aeroplanes."

The Red Cross Drive

"WHEN the President of the United States issues a proclamation in favor of any cause," said "The Philadelphia Inquirer," speaking of the Red Cross Christmas drive, "it is reasonable to assume that it is a very worthy cause and that its success is bound up with the national welfare." That this opinion is general was made especially apparent early in the week by the hearty response to the appeal of the Red Cross for new members. The aim is to add at least ten million to the roll before Christmas, which, with the five million or more who were already enrolled, will raise its membership to nearly 15 per cent of the population of the United States. At this writing it is impossible to give figures, but indications are that the goal will be passed.

According to figures given by former President Taft, the Red Cross grew from a comparatively small membership in 1914 to 200 chapters with 200,000 members in July, 1916. Then there was a great increase, accelerated by the entry of the United States as a belligerent in the war, and in July, 1917, it had grown to 1,800 chapters with over 2,500,000 members. It kept on and at the beginning of this "drive" had 3,300 chapters with membership of over 5,000,000. More than one hundred million dollars has been raised. But this is not enough; more money will be needed; and it was generally felt that 5 per cent only is a ridiculously small proportion of the people for such a cause. "The membership drive," said "The St. Louis Post-Dispatch," urging every one to join, "should bring 30,000,000 more at least."

The movement was extremely well organized, especially in New York City, where it has been under the general direction of Darwin P. Kingsley, aided by many hundreds of efficient helpers chosen from among leading citizens, and by an army of 15,000 women under the chairmanship of Mrs. James W. Gerard. The city's quota was to be half a million. It is likely to be exceeded.

A notable feature of the opening in New York was the large number of "wholesale" memberships. For instance, 1,600 employes of the New York Central Railroad joined in a body. Fire Commissioner Adamson brought in the entire fire department, both civilian and uniformed men. From Endicott, N. Y., 12,000 employes of the Endicott-Johnson Company joined as a unit. Similar enthusiasm was shown in Philadelphia, Chicago and, in fact, throughout the country. In Cleveland the school children were enlisted in a body in the hope of gaining 250,000 new members in that city. This was merely one instance out of many of the widespread interest.

Editorial cooperation was hearty and vigorous everywhere, most notably so perhaps, in the West. "What is wanted now," said "The Spokane Spokesman-Review," "is a universal enlistment in the active membership of a body of men and women that is doing work that thrills the imagination and comforts the soul."

In fact, the only discordant note was struck by the suffragists in their Washington meeting when they refused to cooperate with the Red Cross and vote their contribution to a separate hospital in France. This action, it was explained, was taken because they did not like the alleged attitude of the Red Cross toward women physicians. "Suffragists don't like its attitude toward women in general," said Mrs. Charles Tiffany, at the convention, "and they won't have anything to do with women doctors at all."

The drive has served to enlighten many people as to what the Red Cross actually does and to demonstrate the tremendous importance and magnitude of its work. The report of the War Council covered 135 pages in detailing the work of the past four months; it would take columns even to summarize it. It extends far beyond the immediate nursing and hospital units, and covers the welfare not only of the armies themselves but of the soldiers' families. Let one example suffice: when the Antilles was sunk with the loss of sixty-seven men, leaving 170 survivors with nothing but the clothes they were wearing, the news was telegraphed to Paris and a Red Cross representative, furnished with ample funds and supplies, was sent at once to the port where the survivors landed. He aided the government officials in every way, and also advanced a sum equal to one week's wages to each of the wrecked crew. Clothing was also provided and the families of survivors were communicated with. No red tape, but instant action. And the relief sent to Halifax is also fresh in the public mind.

The question is sometimes asked, "Why doesn't the government do all this itself?" Answering this William Allen White explained in "The New York Evening Post" that while the government could no doubt provide nurses, bandages, clothing, medicines, etc., "merely by adding another expensive bureau to the National Administration" it could not achieve the personal relief and would only "put into politics something that is now kept high and beautiful in life—almost in the field of religion."

Very much of the service is given without any pay. Furthermore, the activity of the Red Cross is international. It extends especially to France—where many hospitals have been built and many thousands of children cared for, and is thus beyond the scope of governmental activity. "The Philadelphia Inquirer" remarks:

"Every dollar given voluntarily for the war means that much less in taxes, and enables the government to put its own funds in things that are vitally needed. We must lend our moral and financial support to every movement which will help to shorten and to win the war. The Red Cross is one of the best of these movements."

Stocking Up for Service

IF YOU are an army officer, new to the service, as are thousands just trained in the United States, how to prepare for overseas service will be a problem. An army officer who knows has written the following suggestions to "Aviation":

"His first suggestion is to settle one's business affairs. Following which he remarks that an application should be filed for the soldiers' and sailors' insurance, the study of French begun, and a checking account with a European house established. A code address should also be listed before leaving this country, and all equipment should be carefully and conspicuously marked. A total of 250 pounds may be carried by officers.

"In view of the prices of equipment abroad, it is advisable to secure, certain things before undertaking a trip overseas. Leather, among other things, is expensive abroad, but, strange to relate, he states that the 'Sam Browne' belts are only $6 and $7 in Paris. The best 'trench' coats in England and France, however, are reported to cost $35, while whipcord breeches with doeskin knees average $6. In general, a dollar in United States money represents 5.70 francs, or 4s 2d. Probably American troops will be paid in French money.

"En route, continues the voyageur, caps are convenient, though not worn over there; in fact, only campaign hats and steel helmets are authorized. Pistols are kept much cleaner and safer if boxed for the trip.

"A list of the officer's suggestions as to equipment follows: Officers' locker or trunk (wardrobe steamer trunks are handy), handbag, with toilet articles, trench mirror, wrist watch, pocket flash-light, flint, wheel and tinder lighter, canned solidified alcohol and tobacco for two months, a short winter coat, knee-laced waterproof boots, boot and shoe laces, fleece-lined gloves, extra hat, shoes and mess outfit, plenty of handkerchiefs and socks, a cable code book, coffee (tea is plentiful), chocolate, soup and beef tablets or a few cans of soup, face and laundry soap, a few books, plenty of United States stamps, a good fountain pen, blank forms and stationery and a wash basin."

Canada Comes Out for Conscription

CANADA'S momentous general election resulted in the return of the Union government to power with unexpectedly large majorities, especially in the West. Sir Robert Borden and his coalition ministry will have at least fifty majority in the new Parliament, and the soldier vote, not yet fully canvassed, may increase this number. The size of the Unionist vote in the normally Liberal Northwest was surprising. The four Western provinces returned but two Liberals out of their fifty members. Quebec alone remained faithful to Laurier, electing sixty-two out of the sixty-five members, the only Unionist victories there being in the English speaking ridings of Montreal.

The outstanding issue of the campaign was the enforcement of conscription for the most vigorous prosecution of the war on Canada's part. As a verdict on this issue the vote is overwhelmingly conclusive. Sir Wilfrid Laurier and the bulk of his Liberal following did not openly oppose conscription, but they called for a referendum on it, that would have caused much delay, and also for modifications to suit the ideas of the French provinces, that would have partially nullified the act. There was also a small radical wing of the opposition, led by Henri Bourassa, which was opposed to any participation in the war until Canada was "actually invaded by Germany." The vote is a loud-voiced answer of the Dominion, expressing its determination to continue Canada's full share in the war. The result in Quebec, however, equally indicates the persistence of French-Canadian opposition to the war, although many minor elements contributed to Laurier's success there.

Nor does the size of the majority adequately measure Canada's devotion to the war, because, as "The Baltimore Sun" explained, "while practically no one opposed to conscription voted for the Unionist candidates, it is probable that a number of citizens who favor conscription voted against them," basing their vote on other grounds.

All of the coalition ministers were elected except two of the French members—Sevigny and Blondin—of Quebec. Sir Robert will have a free hand in the enforcement of all war measures.

The government is thus a true coalition; all domestic matters of disagreement, such as tariff, reciprocity, local government, being postponed until after the war is won, and statesmen of all shades of opinion loyally participating in the attainment of that one purpose. "The New York Sun" thus analyzed it:

"The personal element and also the purely party distinctions held very little place in the vigorous campaign. The question was fought out upon the broad lines of a world issue."

Sir Wilfrid is still immensely popular; but he was "on the wrong side." "He was heard eagerly," said "The New York Times" "by the Western crowds. They admired him, and then voted against him." "The Milwaukee Journal" compared him to American pacifists in that he called for a referendum that would have involved at least delay. "The Omaha Bee" likened him to La Follette; but that was not the predominant feeling in Canada, where his personal popularity remains unimpaired. The rejection of his party was due solely to the Canadian determination to let nothing interfere with winning the war.

That the domestic future of the Dominion is not unclouded, however, appears from the sharp division between the French speaking sections and the rest of the country. "Who," asks "The New York Evening Post," "is going to force Quebec to enforce the conscription law" in the face of her vote, adding: "The outlook is the more unhappy because, in addition to the racial cleavage, the religious line was very clearly drawn."

This situation has an even broader aspect, as The Tribune intimated, editorially, when, emphasizing the world-wide importance of the vote, as a "response to the call of duty which will be heard the world over," it asked: "Is it too much to suspect it may even be heard in Rome?"

Surprise has often been expressed that the French Canadian fails to show any such enthusiasm for the war as one would suppose a people of French ancestry would naturally have. The answer, as has been pointed out by critics who have lived among the inhabitants and know them, seems to be twofold. First, they have little in common with modern France, being the unmixed descendants of emigrants who left the home country before the French Revolution. Their ideas are those of peasant France of nearly two centuries ago. Secondly, while not by any means unintelligent or cowardly, they are, for the most part, very ignorant; out of the current of world affairs. The village priest is their authority. There seems reason to believe that a campaign of enlightenment will materially change their attitude.

Throughout the United States the result of the election was hailed by the press with universal satisfaction. "Canada will do its part to the end," said "The Providence Journal." And The Tribune rejoiced to find that:

"In an hour of depression and weakness Canada has shown the road of courage and victory illuminated by the spirit of self-sacrifice and devotion."

National Prohibition? A Question the States Must Now Decide

THE passage by Congress of a resolution for the submission to the states of a constitutional amendment providing for national prohibition creates the possibility of a "bone-dry" nation within a few years. The resolution passed the House by a vote of 282 to 128, and the Senate concurred by a vote of 47 to 8. Following is the text of the resolution, which needs to be considered in full for an adequate understanding of the situation:

Section 1. After one year from the ratification of this article the manufacture, sale or transportation of intoxicating liquors within, the importation thereof into, the exportation thereof from the United States and all territory subject to the jurisdiction thereof, for beverage purposes, is hereby prohibited.

Sec. 2. The Congress and the several states shall have concurrent power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

Sec. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of the several states, as provided in the Constitution, within seven years from the date of the submission hereof to the states by the Congress.

Thus, before it can become effective, prohibition still has a long road to travel. The adverse vote of thirteen states would suffice to defeat it—but more than half the states are already dry.

There was criticism in Congress of the seven-year proviso, which some lawyers held to be unconstitutional, thus opening the way to prolonged litigation. The second section, providing for "concurrent power" in the Federal and state governments, was also regarded as possibly prolific of trouble in interpretation.

The press of the country received the action with mixed sentiments, although there is a fairly general consensus of opinion that some sort of prohibition is needed as a war measure, and also a widespread belief in the reality of a nation-wide feeling in favor of restraint of the liquor traffic, both on moral and economic grounds. On the other hand, the argument against the efficiency of any sumptuary law, unless overwhelmingly sustained by popular opinion, is made much of in many and diverse quarters.

"The Baltimore Sun" called the act "a mistake which may hurt either the country or temperance." "The New York Times" was also pessimistic, seeing, for one thing, a bad omen for the Democratic party in the prominence of Mr. Bryan in pushing the measure through. "The New York World," declaring that prohibition was to be forced on the reluctant North by the South, said that "this means, as slavery and secession did, the disruption of the Democratic party."

But The Tribune answered that it is not being forced by the South; the votes of either New York, Pennsylvania or Illinois Congressmen would have sufficed to defeat it. There are also those who view with equanimity the possible "disruption of the Democratic party."

The Tribune voiced editorially what is perhaps the prevailing opinion in treating the matter as a war measure of economic rather than moral origin and as a response by Congress to a real demand. "Congress," said The Tribune, "clearly responded to public opinion in submitting the amendment. And its success or failure will depend on the extent to which the people of the states associate it with a thoroughgoing prosecution of the war and with the necessities of after-the-war reorganization."

"The New York Evening Post" also pointed out that the old Prohibition party had nothing to do with it.

Most of the criticism is based on the objection to unenforceable sumptuary laws. In the words of "The Springfield Republican:

"No such sweeping provision of law should be imposed on the nation as a whole, overriding all local or regional diversities of opinion and custom in a vast territorial area, unless it had the sanction of a preponderant public opinion."

It is also criticised as an unwarrantable invasion of states' rights, this argument, curiously enough, being most insistent in the North.

"The New York Sun," although "convinced that the time for submitting a national prohibition amendment has come," protested that the second section, providing an impossible "concurrent power" of definition and enforcement, is a dangerous "muddle."

One thing is plain: the nation is about to be swept by a long-drawn-out and vigorously fought battle. "The prohibition forces," said "The Baltimore American," "will have a heavy uphill fight" to secure ratification.

—From *The New York Tribune*